

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-14 are pending in the present application. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Response After Final and reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259 to Celik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,311 to Douvikas. As stated on page 3 of the final Office Action dated August 19, 2008, the Celik patent does not teach storing a table comprising the names of other users of a web card system or authorization codes associated with such users. The Douvikas patent, in particular column 13, line 40 - column 14, line 14 and Figures 19A-19C, has been cited in order to supply this deficiency of the Celik patent.

The cited passages of the Douvikas patent are asserted to teach a web card system including means for storing a table comprising the names of other users of the web card system and authorization codes, wherein each of the names of the other users in the table is associated with one of the authorization codes, and wherein different authorization codes are associated with different privacy control levels. The Douvikas patent, however, does not in fact disclose this.

The most relevant disclosure of the cited passages of the Douvikas patent is that of Figure 19B, which includes a "privatelist" table in the upper right hand corner. The database structure of Figure 19B, however, simply provides for automatic recognition of user IDs, in particular those of users who have been placed on a "private list" of another user (e.g., a web card owner), and who have thus been granted extra privileges (see, e.g., column 7, lines 14-17 of Douvikas). In this system, anyone who logs in as a user that's been included in the private list will be given the extra privileges, without needing to supply an authorization code provided by the web card owner. This database structure thus does not include separate authorization codes associated with each individual user of

the system as claimed in the present application, and likewise does not teach or suggest the use of authorization codes associated with different privacy control levels.

The system of the Douvikas patent does allow users to pre-set a privacy level for certain information, as shown in Figure 15, and to restrict “Semi-Private” information to a predefined group of users. This aspect of the Douvikas system is thus similar to that of the Hertzog reference (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0069874) which has already been distinguished by the Applicant.

Compared to such prior art systems, the present invention provides greater flexibility and convenience to the owner of web card information, giving the owner control over when another user has access to certain information based on when an authorization code is provided to the other user. In the Douvikas system, by contrast, relevant information of a first user of the system becomes available to a second user as soon as the second user’s permission to receive such information is established in the system. The Douvikas patent therefore does not suggest the present system and method for controlling the privacy of web card information or its advantages.

Independent claims 1 and 6 recite a table comprising the names of other users of a web card system and authorization codes, wherein each of the names of the other users in the table is associated with one of the authorization codes, and wherein different authorization codes are associated with different privacy control levels. This feature of the present invention is not taught or suggested by either the Celik patent or the Douvikas patent, and claims 1 and 6 are therefore nonobvious in view of the Celik and Douvikas patents. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 1 or 6 and are therefore patentable for the foregoing reason, in addition to including independently patentable subject matter. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that all pending claims, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-14, are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If,

however, there remain any issues which can be addressed by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON

Date: October 20, 2008 By: /michael fedrick/
Michael Fedrick
Reg. No. 36,799

100 Corson Street, Third Floor
Pasadena, California 91103-3842
(626) 796-4000
Customer No. 23676